

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 18-25, 30, 32, 36, 40, 42-44, 47-51 and 53-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breek et al (20040210449) in view of Parker (5864757).

Regarding claim 1 Breek et al teaches a method comprising (figs. 1-5):
causing, at least in part, reception at a user equipment of information entity including data fields (para. # 0067, 0077);
verifying internally at said user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment (enter the smart card into the smart card reader and enter his PIN number. Upon entering this information, the system logs the cardholder 1 into smartchip payments checkout process), that automatic inserting information into at least one data field of said information entity is allowed (The cardholder 1 will hit "check out" and the smartchip payments checkout process may auto-generate and transaction information into the appropriate payment field, automatically filled information by downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields, see fig. 7, transaction information are automatically filled into the web shopping page by the card, para. # 0067, 0077-0078); and

when automatic insertion of information is allowed (The cardholder 1 will hit "check out"), automatically inserting at the user equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on information available at the user equipment (The cardholder 1 will hit "check out" and the smartchip payments checkout process may auto-generate and transaction information into the appropriate payment field, automatically filled information by downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields, see fig. 7, transaction information are automatically filled into the web shopping page by the card, para. # 0040, 0042, 0067, 0077-0078).

Breek et al does not teach a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment.

In an analogous art, Parker teaches that the identification code a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment (col. 7, lines 50-65 and abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al by specifically adding feature the identification code mobile equipment identity code in order to provide secure method for executing data by using specific identification code as taught by Parker.

Regarding claim 9 Breek et al teaches wherein at least part of the transaction information to be inserted in the information entity is obtained from a storage unit provided at the user equipment (automatically filled by the card provider 3 or downloaded from a digital wallet) (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 12 Breek et al teaches wherein the information is inserted by transaction processing unit of the user equipment, in a predefined manner and in accordance with predefined instructions that define the information that is to be inserted in the information entity in response to an event (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 16 Breek et al teaches wherein said information entity is transported as a standardized data entity (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claims 18-19 Breek et al data entity is based on the Electronic Commerce Modeling Language (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 20 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates transaction information via an interface that is based on at least one of the following: short message service (SMS); wireless application protocol (WAP); internet protocol (IP); a short range radio link; a proximity card type interface; an infrared link (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1 above).

Regarding claim 21 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment receives the information entity via a first type of interface and returns the information entity via a second type of interface (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 22 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment communicates with a base station (inherent) of a cellular communication network (para. # 0040, 0042, 0067).

Regarding claim 23 Breek et al a user equipment comprising (figs. 1-5):

at least one processor; and at least one memory including computer program code, the at least one memory and the computer program code configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to perform at least the following (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078),

cause, at least in part, reception of an information entity including data fields (para. # 0067, 0077);

verify internally at said apparatus, at least in a part on the basis of an identification code associated with the apparatus, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of said data fields of said information entity is allowed (para. # 0067, 0077-0078),

when automatically insertion of information is allowed b¥ the user, automatically inserting insert at the apparatus information available for the processing unit in at least one of said data fields of said information entity (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078); and

cause, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with said automatically inserted transaction information from the apparatus to a co-operative device over a wireless interface (para. # 0040, 0042, 0066-0067, 0077-0078). Breek et al does not teach a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment.

In an analogous art, Parker teaches that the identification code a mobile equipment identity code assigned by a manufacturer of the user equipment (col. 7, lines 50-65 and abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al by

specifically adding feature the identification code mobile equipment identity code in order to provide secure method for executing data by using specific identification code as taught by Parker.

Regarding claims 24, 42 Breek et al teaches comprising storage unit configured to store the transaction information, wherein the processing unit is adapted to fetch information from said storage means and to insert said information from the storage means into the information entity (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1 above).

Regarding claims 25, 43 Breek et al teaches wherein the processing unit is adapted to obtain information from at least one other information entity and to insert said information from the at least one other information entity into said information entity that is the subject of the information insertion procedure (para. # 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claims 30, 32 Breek et al teaches wherein the information entity is a form; form is selected from the group consisting of a billing details form and shipping detail form (para. # 0040, 0042, 0066-0067, 0077-0078).

Regarding claim 36 Breek et al teaches wherein the transaction information comprises at least one of: name; address; credit card number; telephone number; or passport number (para. # 0040, 0042, 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1, above).

Regarding claims 40, 44 Breek et al teaches the service provider to indicate a selected one of options including acceptance and rejection of the information supplied for inclusion in a form based on a comparison of the identification code to a record of codes (para. # 0040, 0042, 0059, 0066-0067, 0077-0078, see claim 1, above).

Regarding claim 47 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is input by a user of the user equipment (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claim 48 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is stored in the user equipment (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claim 49 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is globally unique (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claim 50 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is an international mobile equipment identity (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claim 51 Breek et al teaches that verifying internally at the user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an input derived from a user that the automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed by the user (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claims 53, 55 Breek et al teaches detecting that information required in another information entity available in the information entity; verifying internally at the user equipment that automatic insertion of the required information into at least one of the data fields of the other information entity is allowed; and when automatic insertion of the required information is allowed, automatically inserting the required information into the at least one data field of the other information entity based on the required information available in the information entity (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1 for more detail).

Regarding claim 54 Breek et al teaches wherein the automatic insertion of the required information of the information entity into the other information entity is conditioned upon that the information entities are associated with an identical service provider (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 1for more detail).

3. Claims 46, 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breek et al (20040210449) in view of Capitant (6976011).

Regarding claims 46 Breek et al teaches a method comprising:
causing, at least in part, reception of at a user equipment of an information entity including data fields (para. # 0067, 0077);
verifying internally at the user equipment, at least in part on the basis of an identification code associated with the user equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed (The cardholder 1 will hit "check out" and the smart chip payments checkout process may auto-generate and transaction information into the appropriate payment field, automatically filled information by downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields, see fig. 7, transaction information are automatically filled into the web shopping page by the card, para. # 0067, 0077-0078);

when automatic insertion of information is allowed, automatically inserting at the user equipment information into at least one data field of the information entity based on information available at the user equipment (The cardholder 1 will hit "check out" and the smart chip payments checkout process may auto-generate and transaction information into the appropriate payment field, automatically filled information by

downloaded from a digital wallet into the payment fields, see fig. 7, transaction information are automatically filled into the web shopping page by the card, para. # 0067, 0077-0078); and

causing, at least in part, transmission of the information entity with the automatically inserted information from the user equipment over a wireless interface, wherein the user equipment is a mobile phone (para. # 0040, 0042, 0067). Breek et al does not teach the identification code being a mobile subscriber identity code assigned by a mobile service operator.

In an analogous art, Capitant et al teaches the identification code being a mobile subscriber identity code assigned by a mobile service operator (col. 5, lines 18-20, col. 10, lines 16-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al by specifically adding feature the identification code a Subscriber Identity Module or IMSI in order to provides secure method for executing data by using specific identification code as taught by Capitant et al, also see claim 1 for more detail.

Regarding claim 56 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is globally unique (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 46 for more detail).

Regarding claim 57 Breek et al teaches wherein the identification code is an international mobile identity IMSI (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 46 for more detail).

Regarding claim 58 Breek et al teaches wherein the user equipment independently verifies, on the basis of the identification code associated with the user

equipment, that automatic insertion of information into at least one of the data fields of the information entity is allowed (para. # 0067, 0077-0078, also see claim 46 for more detail).

4. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breek et al (20040210449) in view of Parker and Lewis (20030105641).

Regarding claim 52 Breek et al and Parker do not teach purchasing an entrance ticket via the wireless interface from a ticket issuer; and redeeming the ticket at an entrance gate by using of the user equipment as an authorization device for the entrance gate.

In an analogous art, Lewis teaches purchasing an entrance ticket via the wireless interface from a ticket issuer; and redeeming the ticket at an entrance gate by using of the user equipment as an authorization device for the entrance gate (para. # 0026-0029). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Breek et al by specifically adding feature purchasing an entrance ticket via the wireless interface from a ticket issuer; and redeeming the ticket at an entrance gate by using of the user equipment as an authorization device for the entrance gate in order to allows a consumer to print out tickets at the consumer's personal computer eliminating the need for the consumer to pick-up tickets at some other location such as box office. The overhead cost, staff, equipment cost inherent with front windows or box office operations are reduced.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 18-25, 30, 32, 36, 40, 42-44 and 46-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHAWAR IQBAL whose telephone number is (571)272-7909. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, GEORGE ENG can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/K. I./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617